

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/254,333	03/04	/1999	RUDOLF SCHWARTE	1184-6LAM	6824		
616	7590	10/06/2003		EXAMINER			
	HAM FIRM REET, SUITE			LUU, TF	IANH X		
	AN DIEGO, CA 92101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2878			

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		P
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	09/254,333	SCHWARTE, RUDOLF
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thanh X Luu	2878
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cov r sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty beriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice ur Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are pending in the applic	eation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are witl	hdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	miner.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 February 1999</u> i	s/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ obje	ected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _		sapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required	' '	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	(119(a)-(d) or (t).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docur		
2. Certified copies of the priority docur	·	
3.⊠ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa * See the attached detailed Office action for a	al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_
14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for don	nestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dor		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	3) 5) Notice of Ir	iummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/254,333 Page 2

Art Unit: 2878

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 10 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 7, 8, 10-16 and 20-34 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 7, 8, 10-16 and 20-34 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-6, 9 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, it is unclear in its given context how many electromagnetic waves are being claimed. Further, "the charge carriers", "the space charge zone", "the

Art Unit: 2878

incident electromagnetic wave", "the potential gradient", and "the charges q_a and q_b " lacks proper antecedent basis. It is also unclear what " U_a " is.

Regarding claim 2, it is unclear if an intensity-modulated electromagnetic wave is the same wave as claimed in claim 1 or a different wave. Further, "the electromagnetic wave" and "the push-pull modulation photogate voltages" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 3, "the charges q_{a1} and q_{b1} as well as q_{a2} and q_{b2} ", "the incident electromagnetic wave" and "the electromagnetic wave" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 4, "the charges q_a , q_b , q_c and q_d " and "the electromagnetic wave" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 5, "the intensity-modulated electromagnetic wave", "the transmitter", "the irradiated electromagnetic wave" and "the phase shift measured with said pixel" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 6, "the push-pull modulation photogate voltages", "the electromagnetic wave" and "the lock-in method" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 9, "photogate voltages U_{am} and U_{bm} " and "the difference image".

Regarding claim 17, "the incident electromagnetic wave" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 19, the term "preferably" is indefinite since it is unclear if the limitation following it is in the claimed invention or not.

Claim 18 is indefinite by virtue of its dependency on an indefinite claim.

Application/Control Number: 09/254,333 Page 4

Art Unit: 2878

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 17-19, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma et al. (U.S. Patent 5,517,043) in view of Wen (U.S. Patent 4,873,561).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Ma et al. disclose (see Figure 4) an element, comprising: at least one pixel; the pixel has at least two light-sensitive modulation photogates (404, 406); and accumulation gates (at 400 and 402). Ma et al. further disclose a middle gate (at 410) between the modulation photogates. Ma et al. do not specifically disclose the accumulation gates are shaded. Wen teaches (see column 4, lines 1-10) providing a shade in order to reduce ambient light interference and improve detection. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a shade the accumulation gates in the apparatus of Ma et al. in view of Wen to improve detection.

Regarding claim 19, Ma et al. in view of Wen disclose the claimed invention as set forth above. Ma et al. and Wen do not specifically disclose four modulation photogates and accumulation gates. However, Ma et al. teach (see column 2, lines 60-68) splitting a photogate to provide higher speed exposure and readout. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Application/Control Number: 09/254,333

Art Unit: 2878

made to provide four photogates and accumulation gates in the apparatus of Ma et al. in

view of Wen to further increase the speed of detection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thanh X. Luu whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM - 4:00

PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Porta, can be reached on (703) 308-4852. The fax phone number for

the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

0956.

txl

September 23, 2003

Thanh X. Luu Patent Examiner

Page 5

Form PTO-1449 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION

Docket No. 1184-6 LAM

Application No. 09/254,333

IN AN APPLICATION (Use Several Sheets If Necessary)				Applicant: RUDOLF SCHWARTE					
				Filing Date: 4 March 1999			Group Art Unit		
		Ū,	S. PATENT D	OCUMEN	TS		•		
EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE :	NAME:		CLASS		FILING [SUBCLASS IF APPRO		DATE COPRIATE
MXC	5,155,363	10/92	STEINBICHLER et al.		250	:	341		
MC	5,381,235	01/95	INOUE et al.		356		376:		
TXL	5,646,733	7/97	BIEMAN	-45,133	356	1,,-7	376	1/29/96	
							RECEIVE		/ED
		# #!				•	1 1	1	i
		FOR	EIGN PATENT	DOCUME	ENTS	•		JAN 0 3	
	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	Coui	NTRY	CLASS		SUBCLASS	TRANSL	er 2600 ATION
W(.	4,439,298	6/00				:	;	YES	NO
TXV	08,313,215	6/96	GERMANY		G 01 S	•	7/481	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	X
600	00,515,215	11/96	JAPAN	-	G 01 B	 -	11/00	X	<u> </u>
		11				:			
						;			+
		1: 1: -1					:		
		::							
						-	·]		
						;	İ		+ +
				I			<u> </u>		<u></u>
			DOCUMENTS						;, Etc.)
TX	Spirig et al., "T	;·					ction of Ligi	nt,"	* ·
	IEEE Journal o	f Quantum E	lectronics, pp.	1705-1708	3, (Sept. 1	995).	·		<u>.</u>
724	Suzuki et al., " modulating lase	Suzuki et al., "Real-time two-dimensional surface profile measurement in a sinusoidal phase-modulating laser diode interferometer," Optical Engineering, pp. 2754-2758 (Aug. 1994).							
XAMINER	////			DATE CON	SIDERE	D	9/05	:	
AMINER: Init	tial if citation is considered wh	-					1		

EXAMINER: Initial if citation is considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP § 609: Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to the applicant. (2/92 PTO)

Form PTO-1449 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION IN AN APPLICATION (Use Several Sheets If Necessary)				Docket No. 1184-6 LAM Application No. 09/254,333					
				Applicant: RUDOLF SCHWARTE					
				Filing Date:	4 March 1999	Group Art Unit			
		U.S	S. PATENT D	OCUMENT	TS				
EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME		CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE		
ate	5,155,363	10/92	STEINBICHLER et al.		250	341			
+KL	5,381,235	01/95	INOUE et al.		356	376			
YXV	5,646,733	7/97	BIEMAN	_	356	376	1/29/96		
							9		
		FORE	IGN PATEN	T DOCUME	ENTS				
		5.475	001			011001400	TRANSLA	ATION	
	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	YES.	NO	
MI	4,439,298	6/96	GERMANY		G 01 S	7/481	1	X	
TXV	08,313,215	11/96	JAPAN		G 01 B	11/00	×		
				·		-			
							-		
				<u></u> -					
· ·									
	<u> </u>								
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					<u> </u>		
		OTHER	DOCUMENT	S (Includi	ing Author, Title	, Date, Perti	nent Pages	s, Etc.)	
4XC	Spirig et al., "1	Spirig et al., "The Lock-In CCD – Two-Dimensional Synchronous Detection of Light,"							
1	IEEE Journal	of Quantum E	lectronics, p	p. 1705-170	08, (Sept. 1995).				
TXL		Suzuki et al., "Real-time two-dimensional surface profile measurement in a sinusoidal phase-modulating laser diode interferometer," Optical Engineering, pp. 2754-2758 (Aug. 1994).							
		1					*		
EXAMINER ///				DATE CONSIDERED					
	nitial if citation is considered. ye ered. Include copy of this form				PEP § 609; Draw line	through citation	if not in confo	ormance	

(2/92 PTO)